DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 701 EA 008 619

AUTHOR Wolf, W. C., Jr.
TITLE The Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project Response Survey.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Occupational Surveys; *Organizational Change; School Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project

ABSTRACT

This survey was intended to determine the relationship between educators' previous involvement with institutional change and their interest in the Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project (MDAP). Materials describing MDAP were mailed to 159 school administrators who had indicated an initial interest in MDAP. Respondents were divided into four categories based on their response to the materials, ranging from group A, individuals who chose to discontinue contact with MDAP, to group D, individuals who indicated the greatest interest in MDAP. Phone interviews were conducted with a random sample of individuals from each group and the resulting data were analyzed to determine similarities and differences between the early dropout group and the three more tenacious groups. It was hypothesized that individuals with limited previous experience with institutional change would be less responsive to MDAP than individuals with extensive previous involvement. However, individuals across all four groups reported extensive previous involvement, and members of group A differed little from members of group D in this respect. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED127701

THE MASSACHUSETTS DIFFUSION ASSISTANCE PROJECT

RESPONSE SURVEY

W. C. WOLF, JR.

22 Mt. Pleasant

Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

413-549-0159

EA 008 613

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview 1

Procedures 2

Sample Selection 2

Instrumentation 3

Analysis of Data 3

The Data 5

Within Group Synopses 5

Across Group Synopses 9

Analyses of Data 16

General 16

Specific 17

Discussion 19

Appendix 21

OVERVIEW

Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project (MDAP) staff mailed--in the Fall of 1974--an initial awareness package to individuals associated with six different Massachusetts groups to create awareness of the MDAP undertaking. This mailing resulted in the return of 159 response forms (as of mid-March), which indicated an initial expression of interest in activities described. Three different sets of materials--a public school, a parochial school, and a private school variation--were then mailed to appropriate leadership personnel representing each of the responding school sites. Included in these materials were a Developer-Demonstrator (D/D) project catalogue, a project priorities list, and an application for assistance in adopting a D/D project. One hundred eleven people discontinued contact with MDAP staff sometime after receiving the second set of materials. Whereas 62 people returned the project priorities lists, only 26 were completed in accordance with the prescribed specifications.

The overarching purpose of this survey was to determine relationships between individuals' previous involvement with institutional change on the one hand and individuals' current involvement with the MDAP project on the other. To make this determination, random samples were drawn on the basis of individuals' responses to the various MDAP overtures described. It was believed that individuals with limited previous involvement in institutional change would not be very responsive to the MDAP opportunities, whereas individuals with extensive previous involvement in institutional change would be particularly responsive to the MDAP opportunities.

PROCEDURES

A. Sample Selection. Initial plans involved deriving random samples from two groups--those who discontinued contact with the MDAP effort sometime after returning initial expression of interest response forms, and those who eventually submitted the full complement of project priorities lists. W. C. Wolf, Jr. intended to interview these people by telephone to ascertain similarities and differences among the two groups. These plans were altered because of the nature of responses received by MDAP staff.

An opportunity was presented to compartmentalize randomly chosen individuals within four groups on the basis of responses received. The first group consisted of those individuals who discontinued contact with the MDAP effort sometime after returning initial expression of interest response forms. Ten per cent of the 111 people who fall into this category, or 11, were randomly selected; eight were actually interviewed.

The second, third, and fourth groups consisted of individuals who actually returned project priorities lists, but in various states of completion. The full complement of project priorities lists were not returned by all specified individuals within the second group. Thirty two per cent of the 22 people who fall into this category, or 7, were randomly selected; 7 were actually interviewed. The full complement of project priorities lists were submitted--but in conflict--by individuals within the third group. Sixty four per cent of the 14 people who fall into this category, or 9, were randomly selected; 7 were actually interviewed. The full complement of project priorities lists were submitted, in order, by individuals within the fourth group. Thirty five per cent of the 25 people who fall into this category, or 9, were randomly selected; 9 were actually interviewed.

Table One describes the study sample in terms of total population (N=159), the sample randomly derived (N=36), the sample actually interviewed (N=31), and

the roles of the sample interviewed. Principals/Directors of elementary and secondary schools constituted the modal group (N=17) interviewed.

B. Instrumentation. A letter was mailed by Wolf on March 10, 1975, to all individuals selected indicating that he would like to chat with them about how educational changes take place within their respective settings of practice. All follow-up telephone calls were completed within one month of this mailing. In all 36 letters were mailed, and 31 interviews were completed. Three telephone numbers could not be obtained, and two individuals did not answer their phone after eight different attempts. A copy of the letter is included in the Appendix.

The actual interview varied in length from about five minutes to more than thirty minutes. Typically, the interview was completed in fifteen to twenty minutes. Subject contact proved to be more difficult than conducting the actual interview, because of individuals' varying schedule commitments throughout the school day.

The interview consisted of three sections: the first focused upon previous efforts to change educational practice within the interviewee's school setting; the second focused upon efforts to change educational practice within the interviewee's school setting during the course of the next school year; and the third focused upon the interviewee's awareness of and involvement with the MDAP undertaking. A format for the telephone interview was prepared and adhered to by Wolf during each interview.

After the interview format was prepared, it was reviewed and critiqued by members of the MDAP staff. Their suggestions were used to revise the format prior to initiating the interviews. A copy of the revised interview format is included in the Appendix.

C. Analysis of Data. Each telephone interview was tape recorded by Wolf.

Source of Data	Total Population	Sample Derived	Sample Interviewed	Roles of Sample Interviewed					
				Teachers	Principals/ Directors	Central Administration (Supts., etc.)	Counselors	School Committee	Other
A. People who discontinued contact sometime after returning initial material to MDAP.	111	11 (10%)	8 (73%)	1	5	2	-	-	-
B. Full complement of project priorities lists not yet returned by specified groups.	22	7 (32%)	7 (100%)	1	5	-	1	-	-
C. Full complement of project priorities lists submitted, but in conflict.	14 people representing 5 different sites	9 people representing 3 different sites (64%)	7 people representing 3 different sites (78%)	2	4	-	-	1	-
D. Full complement of project priorities lists submitted and in order.	26	9 (35%)	9 (100%)	3	3	3	-	-	-
TOTALS	159	36 (23%)	31 (86%)	7	17	5	1	1	-

TABLE ONE: THE STUDY SAMPLE

He then gleaned from the tape, data that pertained to the three primary foci of the interview. These data constitute the basis for all analyses subsequently conducted.

Data were pooled initially within each of the four sources of information previously mentioned. One of these sources included individuals who discontinued contact after returning initial material to the MDAP staff; the other three sources maintained contact with varying degrees of effectiveness. After within-group patterns of activity were recorded, these "pattern responses" served as the basis for cross-group comparisons.

The cross-group analyses focused upon similarities and differences between the early drop-out group and the three more tenacious groups. These comparisons were based upon (a) the recent histories of successful educational changes reported; (b) the future outlook for successful educational changes reported; and (c) involvements with MDAP reported. It was hoped data obtained would highlight similarities and differences between the early drop-out group and the only group responsible for returning the full complement of project priorities lists.

It is important to remember that all data have been derived via telephone interviews with individuals who were asked to recall specific events and specific sequences of events. The accuracy of these data are directly related to the integrity of each interviewee and to the ability of each interviewee to recall the events and sequences of events sought.

THE DATA

Information gleaned from each interview is summarized by sub-group initially, then, across the four subgroups. The interview sequence (see Appendix) serves as the format for reporting data obtained.

Within Group Synopses

Group A. Five of the eight people who responded attempted to change educational practices in their schools within the past several years. Two of the changes described were moderately complicated (an individualized math program and initiating individualized instructional options within the classroom), whereas three were most complex (utilizing behavioral objectives as the basis for instruction while at the same time abandoning a flexible modular scheduling system, changing a conventional parochial elementary school to a residential integrated day type program for 766 type special needs children, and moving into an open space school).

Awareness of the five new school options was traced to three sources within the school setting involved in the change (specifically to two principals and one active school staff); to one source within the community involved (a school building planning committee); and to one source outside the community involved (external consultants and a college course). These changes were motivated by administrative edict in three instances and by teaching staff dissatisfaction with existing practices in two instances. These change undertakings proved to be a bust in one setting, so-so in three settings, and successful in one setting.

Four of the eight people who responded planned to change at least one aspect of their school practice within the next year or so. Three of the changes described were moderately complicated (adoption of the Croft reading skills program across four separate classrooms in a regrouped context, a computer-based flexible scheduling system, and adoption of the Scott-Foresman

individualized math program), whereas one was most complex (expanded use of a behavioral objective based program). All four planned changes described were supported by the central administrators; two were supported by teachers involved.

Five of the eight responding persons were aware of the Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project; four learned of MDAP via the mail and one via word of mouth. Only one of the five indicated a staff discussion of the MDAP overture, and only one expressed interest in pursuing a specific project (Project Adventure).

Group B. Five of the seven people who responded attempted to change educational practices in their schools within the past several years. All five changes described were most complex (an alternative parent-teacher dominated school, a modified open alternative school, an IGE plus Greater Cleveland math program, and two open classroom operations).

Awareness of the five new school options was traced to one source within the school setting involved in the change (a school principal); to one source within the community involved (a group of parents); and to one source outside the community involved (external consultant). Two sources could not be recalled. These changes were motivated by administrator dissatisfaction with existing practices in one instance, and by teaching staff desires to change existing practices in three instances. The motivation for change in one instance could not be recalled. These change undertakings proved to be so-so in two settings, and successful in three settings.

All seven people who responded planned to change at least one aspect of their school practice within the next year or so. One of the changes described was not complicated (a new grade card), three were moderately complicated (a group counseling program, a new reading program, and an individualized reading program), whereas three were most complex (an open school, a major building

renovation, and an intermediate level elementary school reorganization). Six of these seven planned changes were supported by the central administrators; four were supported by the teaching staff and two prompted a split among the teaching staff; and two received community support.

Six of the seven responding persons were aware of MDAP; all learned of MDAP via the mail. Six of the seven indicated a staff discussion of the MDAP overture which contributed to four of the seven attending an awareness conference. Three of the seven expressed interest in pursuing a specific project (Project Adventure, Talents Unlimited, and a reading project).

Group C. Five of the seven people who responded attempted to change educational practices in their schools within the past several years. One of the changes described was moderately complicated (a criterion referenced reading test package), whereas four were most complicated (an open high school, individualized curriculum and methodology in a high school, a seven town cooperative special pupil needs program, and an alternative high school).

Awareness of the five new school options was traced to three sources within the school setting involved in the change (specifically two central administrators and to teaching faculty meetings); and, to two sources within the community involved (parents in both instances). These changes were motivated by administrative edict in one instance, by teachers and administrators cooperatively attempting to align school operations to childrens' needs more effectively, by all involved parties seeking more viable options for children, and by two bootstap broad-based efforts to more effectively respond to childrens' needs. These change undertakings proved to be so-so in one setting, and successful in four settings.

Five of the seven people who responded planned to change at least one aspect of their school practice within the next year or so. Four of the

changes described were moderately complicated (two sought to individualize specific aspects of instruction, one offered a different staffing arrangement within a specific program, and one hope to use computers to control information processes; whereas one was most complex (pursue a curriculum for life experiences). All five planned changes described were supported by the central administrators; three were supported by teachers involved.

Six of the seven responding persons were aware of MDAP; four learned of the project via the mail and two via word of mouth. Six of the seven indicated a staff discussion of the MDAP overture which contributed to two of the seven attending an awareness conference. Three of the seven expressed interest in pursuing a specific project (Project Focus, Outward Bound, and a language arts project), and three indicated interest in several different--but unspecified--projects.

Group D. Four of the eight who responded (one additional person in this group refused to be interviewed) attempted to change educational practices in their schools within the past several years. One of the changes described was moderately complicated (increase unscheduled time for students), whereas three were most complex (revamp entire evaluation policy of school, establish differentiated staff within high school, and establish an alternative school).

Awareness of the four new school options was traced to four sources within the school setting involved in the change (specifically to one principal and to three faculty committee efforts). These changes were motivated by principal dissatisfaction with the level of teacher involvement in decision-making, and by three teaching faculties' dissatisfaction with existing practices. These change undertakings proved to be a bust in one setting, and so-so in three settings.

Seven of the eight people who responded planned to change at least one aspect of their school practice within the next year or so. Three of the

changes described were moderately complicated (Project LEM, a physical education program, and mini courses combined with a teacher advisory board), whereas four were most complex (a change to a trimester system, a coordinated K-12 math program, a differentiated staff/open classroom program, and a management by objectives school-wide operation). All seven planned changes described were supported by the central administration; three were supported by teachers involved

All eight responding persons were aware of MDAP, seven learned of it via the mail and one via word of mouth. All eight indicated a staff discussion of the MDAP overture which contributed to two of the eight attending an awareness conference. Five of the eight expressed interest in pursuing one or more specific projects (in all they cited nine projects).

Across Group Synopses

Recent History of Successful Educational Change. The extent and complexity of prior successful educational change activity is reported across sub-groups as follows:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Level of Complexity of Change		
		Simple	Moderately Complex	Most Complex
A	5:8	-	2	3
B	5:7	-	-	5
C	5:7	-	1	4
D	4:8 (one no response)	-	1	3

The most noteworthy conclusion to be drawn from these data is that 15 of the 19 successful educational change efforts described were most complex undertakings.

Sources of awareness of the educational innovations adopted clustered within three categories:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Sources of Awareness of Innovations			
		Within School	Within Community of School	Outside Community	Other
A	5:8	3	1	1	-
B	5:7	1	1	1	2
C	5:7	3	2	-	-
D	4:8 (one no response)	4	-	-	-

Within school sources of awareness of the new innovations accounted for eleven of the nineteen sources mentioned, only two of the sources mentioned were external to the community involved in educational change.

Changes described were motivated for the most part either by administrative edict or by administrator/teaching staff dissatisfaction with existing practices. For example:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Motivation to Initiate Changes			
		Administrator Initiative	Teaching Staff Initiative	Cooperative Initiative	Other
A	5:8	3	2	-	-
B	5:7	1	3	-	1
C	5:7	1	-	4	-
D	4:8 (one no response)	1	3	-	-

The most noteworthy conclusion to be drawn from these data is that only 4 of the 19 successful educational change efforts could be attributed to the cooperative initiative of administrators, teachers, and to some extent parents. Furthermore, not one of the verbal accounts attributed the motivation for change to pupil initiative.

The impact of these changes upon educational settings varied considerably:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Effect of Change Upon Educational Practice		
		A Bust	So-So	Successful
A	5:8	1	3	1
B	5:7	-	2	3
C	5:7	-	1	4
D	4:8 (or no response)	1	3	-

Eight of the nineteen educational change endeavors described succeeded, whereas only two proved to be a bust, according to the perceptions of individuals interviewed.

The Future Outlook For Successful Educational Change. The extent and complexity of anticipated successful educational change activity is reported across sub-groups as follows:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Level of Complexity of Change		
		Simple	Moderately Complex	Most Complex
A	4:8	-	3	1
B	7:7	1	3	3
C	5:7	-	4	1
D	7:8 (one no response)	-	3	4

Perhaps it is worth noting that nine most complex changes as contrasted with one simple change were described; and, that 22 of the 23 changes described were moderately complex or most complex endeavors.

The success of these anticipated successful educational change activities was based upon the extent of administrator, teacher, and parent support already generated. For example:

Group	Frequency of Changes	Levels of Support For Anticipated Change		
		Administrators	Teachers	Parents
A	4:8	4	2	-
B	7:7	6	4	2
C	5:7	5	3	-
D	7:8 (one no response)	7	3	-

Nearly 100% of the anticipated changes described were supported by administrators; slightly more than half of these undertakings were supported by teachers; and hardly 10% were supported by parents.

Involvement with MDAP. Since members of Group A opted out of a continuing relation with members of MDAP sometime after returning initial expression of interest response forms, primary interest in this section will be focused upon the responses of members of the other three groups. Groups B, C, and D sustained communication with MDAP staff through the present time. Group members' awareness of the MDAP undertaking is summarized as follows:

Group	N	Aware of MDAP	Not Aware of MDAP
A	8	5	3
B	7	6	1
C	7	6	1
D	8 (one no response)	8	-

Approximately 83% of the persons interviewed were aware of the MDAP undertaking.

Most individuals interviewed learned about MDAP from the Mail:

Group	Awareness of MDAP	Source of Awareness of MDAP		
		Mail	Word of Mouth	Other
A	5:8	4	1	-
B	6:7	6	-	-
C	6:7	4	2	-
D	8:8 (one no response)	7	1	-

The mail proved to be the most effective way to develop awareness of the MDAP undertaking.

Persons interviewed treated MDAP information received in different ways:

Group	Awareness of MDAP	Action Taken Regarding MDAP		
		No Action	Staff Discussion	Attended Awareness Conference
A	5:8	4	1	-
B	6:7	1	6	4
C	6:7	1	6	2
D	8:8 (one no response)	-	8	2

The MDAP materials contributed to extensive staff discussion and contributed to attendance at MDAP awareness conferences.

Interest in following up specific Title III projects outlined in the MDAP materials varied across groups:

Group	Awareness of MDAP	No Interest In Title III Projects	Following Up At Least One Title III Project
A	5:8	4	1
B	6:7	3	3
C	6:7	3	3
D	8:8 (one no response)	3	5

The most noteworthy conclusion to be drawn from these data is that twelve individuals expressed interest in following up at least one Title III project.

An overview of data describing similarities and differences between Groups A (the early dropout group) and Group D (the only group to return all requested data) revealed many similarities and few meaningful differences. These parallel profiles were not anticipated.

ANALYSES OF DATA

General. The overarching purpose of this survey was to determine relationships between individuals' previous involvement with institutional change on the one hand and individuals' current involvement with the MDAP project on the other. It was believed that individuals with limited previous involvement in institutional change would not be very responsive to the MDAP opportunities, whereas individuals with extensive previous involvement in institutional change would be particularly responsive to the MDAP opportunities. Individuals across all four sub-groups studied reported extensive previous involvement in institutional change. This discovery negated the kinds of analyses envisioned both across sub-groups structured and across educational roles selected.

Perhaps the most disappointing outcome of this investigation was the recognition that Group A, the early dropout group, and Group D, the only group to comply fully with MDAP data needs, differed little in reported involvement in previous and anticipated successful educational change activity. More profound differences between these two groups was anticipated. Furthermore, Groups B and C both slightly surpassed Group D in reported involvement in previous and anticipated successful educational change activity. More compatible performance was anticipated among these groups; hence, results obtained were not entirely unexpected.

The involvement of Groups B, C, and D with MDAP varied little. Given Group B's failure to return needed materials and Group C's conflicting priorities lists, it was not unreasonable to believe both groups might differ from Group D in some meaningful manner. Such was not the case.

The most illuminating outcomes of the study were neither hypothesized nor anticipated. Nevertheless, these results are worthy of serious review. First, most individuals interviewed described educational change efforts which were particularly complex; second, only two of the sources of awareness

of innovations mentioned were external to the communities involved in educational change; third, few of the successful educational change efforts could be attributed to the cooperative initiative of involved individuals; and fourth, about 60% of the individuals who sustained interest in the MDAP venture expressed interest in following up at least one of the Title III projects being diffused.

Specific. As mentioned previously, individuals across all four sub-groups and across all educational roles studied reported extensive previous involvement in institutional change. This discovery negated the kinds of specific analyses envisioned. However, the serendipitous benefits of the investigation constituted a mother lode of information. These data are reviewed more precisely in this section of the report.

Among the cross-group synopses, the following deserve especial attention:

A. Recent History of Successful Educational Change:

1. 15 of the 19 successful educational change efforts described were most complex undertakings.
2. Only two of the sources of awareness of innovations mentioned were external to the community involved in educational change.
3. Only four of the 19 successful educational change efforts could be attributed to the cooperative initiative of administrators, teachers, and to some extent parents. Furthermore, not one of the verbal accounts attributed the motivation for change to pupil initiative.
4. Only two of the 19 educational change endeavors described proved to be a bust.

B. The Future Outlook For Successful Educational Change:

1. 22 of the 23 changes described were moderately complex or most complex endeavors.

2. Nearly 100% of the anticipated changes were supported by administrators; 50% by teachers; and hardly 10% by parents.

C. Involvement With MDAP:

1. Approximately 83% of the persons interviewed were aware of the MDAP undertaking.
2. The mail proved to be the most effective way to develop awareness of the MDAP undertaking.
3. The MDAP materials contributed to extensive staff discussion and contributed to attendance at MDAP awareness conferences.
4. Eleven individuals--about 60% of Groups B, C, and D, who sustained interest in the MDAP undertaking--expressed interest in following up at least one of the Title III projects.

DISCUSSION

This investigation yielded few dividends in those areas where dividends were expected, and many serendipitous dividends in unanticipated areas. Since individuals across all four sub-groups and across all educational roles studied reported extensive previous and anticipated involvement in institutional change, the analyses conducted were not fruitful. These across-group affirmative accounts suggest that individuals who responded to the MDAP overture initially may have had much in common with regard to educational change. Sustenance of this initial interest in MDAP work seems unrelated to previous and anticipated involvement in institutional change.

Several unanticipated consequences of this inquiry deserve attention. First the vast majority of previous successful involvements in institutional change reported were most complex undertakings, and nearly all of the anticipated successful involvements in institutional change reported were moderately complex or most complex endeavors. These results differ starkly from research reported by Wolf and Fiorino some five years ago.

Second, most of the successful institutional change endeavors described were initiated, sustained, and consummated without the assistance of change agents external to the locus of change. Only two individuals mentioned changes which were stimulated by external change agents; none attributed the sustenance and consummation activity to external change agents. These results run counter to the experiences of the Cooperative Extension Service, U.S.D.A., and to a substantial accumulation of diffusion research. Possibly, the individuals interviewed were drawing upon cosmopolite resources, and the interview format adhered to wasn't honed to discern these particular data. Possibly, the individuals interviewed represent local educational agencies within Massachusetts that have operationalized the concept of institutional self-renewal. Or possibly, a unique localite phenomenon has been uncovered.

Whatever, confirmation of data derived via telephone interviews is needed to move from conjecture to comprehension.

Third, few of the successful institutional change undertakings could be related to cooperative undertakings which involved all parties to be influenced by the change. Instead either administrative initiative or teaching staff initiative--but not both in concert--accounted for the successful enterprise. Parents were hardly a factor in the process, and pupils were consistently ignored in the process. These results conflict with beliefs held by many educators that a broad base of support contributes meaningfully to the successful institutionalization of innovations. These results are compatible with previous research reported by Brickell, Gross and others.

Finally, the process conceived by MDAP staff to involve LEAs in their dissemination undertaking certainly produced positive results. About 60% of the individuals drawn from Groups B, C, and D who were interviewed expressed interest in following up at least one of the Title III projects. The desired aspiration of MDAP is involvement, and that is most certainly occurring.

APPENDIX

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

March 10, 1975

[Inside Address Here]

Dear Colleague:

I have spent more than a decade studying the phenomenon of educational knowledge diffusion and utilization with the hope that my efforts may improve modes of communication in our field some day. During this period of inquiry, I have experienced a generous portion of both success and failure. The successes keep me going. My purpose in corresponding with you relates to this continuing inquiry pattern.

I shall contact you by telephone at your office in the reasonably near future. At that time, I would like to chat with you about how educational changes take place within your setting of practice. I am interested in the collective behavior of you and your colleagues on this topic; hence, no inquiries will be focused upon your personal practice.

Our conversation will be quite brief and to the point to conserve your time and my phone bill. I am looking forward to our chat.

Most cordially,

Bill Wolf

W. C. Wolf, Jr.
Professor and Chairperson,
Center for Educational Research

WCW:nr

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW A

My name is Bill Wolf. I'm following up a letter I sent to you recently. May I chat with you for a few moments about educational change?

Yes: Continue No: Terminate

1. Have you and your professional colleagues tried to change any aspect of educational practice in your schools within the past several years?

   Yes: Continue No: Go on to item two

   a. Describe the change(s) attempted.
   b. How did you and your colleagues become aware of this/these new alternative(s)?
   c. What motivated your group to initiate the change(s)?
   d. What happened as a result of your efforts?

2. Can you identify one aspect of educational practice in your schools which is likely to be successfully changed within the next several years?

   Yes: Continue No: Go on to item three

   a. Describe the practice to be successfully changed.
   b. Why do you believe this change effort will be successful?

3. The U.S.O.E. recently funded a national program that enables personnel from selected Title III and other projects to work with interested educators outside their immediate locales. The Network of Innovative Schools, through its Massachusetts Diffusion Assistance Project, has been assigned the task of acquainting Massachusetts educators and community leaders with these projects and assisting interested persons in the sometimes difficult process of adopting them within their setting of practice. MDAP personnel have utilized a variety of methods to communicate their intentions in recent months. Are you aware of the MDAP undertaking?

   Yes: Continue No: Conclude interview

   a. In what way or ways did you and your colleagues learn about the MDAP undertaking?
   b. How did you and your colleagues treat information provided by the MDAP?
   c. Have you and your colleagues expressed interest in following-up any of the Title III projects outlined?

Yes	No
(1) Which project(s)?	(1) Why did you chose not to follow-up this overture?
(2) What plans are you making to pursue your interest?	

Many thanks for the time you have generously offered me.